

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The applicants have studied the office action mailed April 16, 2009, and believe the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5, 14-20, 26-30 and 39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stevens, ("TCP/IP Illustrated, Volume 1 "), and further in view of Aweya et al., (US Patent No. 7,047,312), (hereinafter Aweya). Claims 6-13, 21-25 and 31-38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stevens-Aweya as applied to claims 1, 15 and 26 above, and further in view of Boyd et al., (US Publication No. 2004/0049580), (hereinafter Boyd). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, for example, is directed to a "method for sending data, comprising: establishing an active connection adapted to send packets of data between a host and a destination; receiving from the destination a first window value representing a first quantity of data packets; sending packets of data from said host to said destination; receiving an acknowledgment from said destination for each packet of data received by said destination wherein said first window value represents a limit imposed on said host by said destination on the quantity of data packets sent from said host to said destination and lacking an acknowledgment of being received by destination; limiting the number of packets sent by said host, but not acknowledged as received by said destination, to a second quantity of data packets less than said first window value wherein said second quantity represents a limit imposed by said host on the quantity of data packets sent from said host to said destination and lacking an acknowledgment of being received by destination and wherein said second quantity is a function of the number of active connections of the host; establishing a plurality of active direct memory access connections between said host and a plurality of specified memory locations of a plurality of destinations; sending a plurality of messages to specified memory locations of the destinations of the direct memory access connections wherein each message comprises a plurality of data packets; receiving message acknowledgments, each message acknowledgment being sent by a destination for each message received by the destination; and establishing a plurality of message limits, each message limit imposing a separate limit for each direct memory access connection on the quantity of messages sent from said host to the specified memory location of the direct memory access connection associated with the message limit and lacking a message acknowledgment of being received by the destination of the direct memory access connection associated with the message limit."

The Examiner concedes, for example, that:

Stevens-Aweya does not specifically disclose establishing a plurality of active direct memory access connections between said host and a plurality of specified memory locations of a plurality of destinations; sending a plurality of messages to specified memory locations of the destinations of the direct memory access connections wherein each message comprises a plurality of data packets; receiving message acknowledgments, each message acknowledgment being sent by a destination for each message received by the destination; and establishing a plurality of message limits, each message limit imposing a separate limit for each direct memory access connection on the quantity of messages sent from said host to the specified memory location of the direct memory access connection associated with the message limit and lacking a message acknowledgment of being received by the destination of the direct memory access connection associated with the message limit.

Instead, it is the Examiner's position that "Boyd further discloses ... establishing a plurality of message limits, each message limit imposing a separate limit for each direct memory access connection on the quantity of messages sent from said host to the specified memory location of the direct memory access connection associated with the message limit and lacking a message acknowledgment of being received by the destination of the direct memory access connection associated with the message limit" citing Boyd, paragraph 122. The applicants respectfully disagree.

It is believed that the Examiner's citation to the Boyd reference refers to the discussion of a Maximum Remote Direct Memory Access (MRDMA) field 1120 which is described as the "maximum number of outstanding RDMA Read Requests from the remote socket." It is believed that the term RDMA Read Requests in the context refers to packets, not messages. Accordingly, it is believed that the cited Maximum Remote Direct Memory Access (MRDMA) field describes maximum number of outstanding read request packets, not messages, from the remote socket. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's citations to the Stevens, Aweya and Boyd references, considered alone or in combination, have no teaching or suggestion of "establishing a plurality of message limits, each message limit imposing a separate limit for each direct memory access connection on the quantity of messages sent from said host to the specified memory location of the direct memory access connection associated with the message limit and lacking a message acknowledgment of being received by the destination of the direct memory access connection associated with the message limit" as required by claim 1.

Independent claims 15 and 26 may be distinguished in a similar fashion.

The rejection of the dependent claims is improper for the reasons given above.

Moreover, the dependent claims include additional limitations, which in combination with the base and intervening claims from which they depend provide still further grounds of patentability over the cited art. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the rejection of the claims should be withdrawn.

The Examiner has made various comments concerning the anticipation or obviousness of certain features of the present inventions. Applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants have addressed those comments directly hereinabove or the Examiner's comments are deemed moot in view of the above response.

#### Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims are patentable. Should any additional fees be required beyond those paid, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-0585.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7970 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: July 16, 2009

By:

/William Konrad/

William K. Konrad  
Registration No. 28,868

Please direct all correspondences to:

William K. Konrad  
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP  
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210  
Beverly Hills, CA 90212  
Tel: (310) 553-7970  
Fax: 310-556-7984